

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed November 10, 2004, and further to the Notice of Appeal filed March 9, 2005, claims 28-29, 41-42, 50-51, and 62-71 have been cancelled without prejudice and without disclaimer; and claims 21, 30, 36, 43, 48, and 52 have been amended. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 21-27, 30-40, 43-49, and 52-61 are pending. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is requested.

Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

Applicants note that the Examiner has not addressed the electronic IDS filed February 10, 2005. Applicants request that the Examiner consider the references included therewith, and return a signed and initialed copy of the corresponding PTO 1449 form with the next Office Action.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 21-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,529,903 to Smith *et al.* (hereinafter "Smith"). Applicants disagree with the rejections set forth by the Examiner. However, solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, the claims have been amended to clarify various points of novelty over Smith.

In particular, independent claim 21 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, the feature of enabling the wireless client device to select an application action for execution on one or more messages that reside on the at least one remote server, wherein the selected application action includes editing the one or more messages that match the search criteria. Independent claims 36 and 48 include similar recitations.

In an exemplary embodiment, the invention may provide search capabilities on a wireless client device. See Specification, e.g., page 3, line 11. Search criteria may include searching messages (e.g., emails, memos, and/or other correspondence and

documents) based on various fields such as sender, date, subject and other parts of a message. See Specification, e.g., page 3, lines 11-14. Messages matching the search criteria may then be displayed and edited on the wireless client device. See Specification, e.g., page 22, lines 4-6.

Smith fails to disclose at least this feature. By contrast, Smith appears to disclose a system that generates disambiguated search results in response to an ambiguous search query that is input from a keypad of a wireless client, such as a telephone. See Smith, e.g., col. 1, line 35-col. 2, line 21. Moreover, the Examiner explicitly concedes that this feature, and other additional features of Applicants' invention, as claimed, are not disclosed by Smith. See Final Office Action of November 10, 2004, e.g., page 4, paragraph 2.5. As such, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is clearly improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: May 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,


Reg. No. 47,429

For:

Customer No. 00909

Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, VA 22102
703-905-2107